

CHURCH



RECORD.

A Weekly Paper, devoted chiefly to the cause of Christianity and Education.

VOL. I.

FLUSHING, N. Y., AUGUST 14, 1841.

NO. 38.

THE CHURCH RECORD.

FRANCIS L. HAWKS, D. D.,

PROPRIETOR AND EDITOR.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING, BY
CHARLES R. LINCOLN, FLUSHING, N. Y.

TERMS—Three Dollars per annum, in advance.

Historical.

From the Fulham Manuscripts.

A TRUE ACCOUNT of a conference at Lambeth, Dec. 27th, 1697.

(CONCLUDED.)

INTERLOCUTORS.

C., Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
L., Henry, Lord Bishop of London.
By., Mr. Byrd.
P., Mr. John Povey.
Bl., Mr. Blair.
M., Mr. Marshall.
H., Mr. Harrison.

By. As to the lands, my lord, the law is open; the governor cannot hinder people of their rights.

P. My lord, the land on the south side of Black Water, was all along designed to be opened, and there was an order for opening it in my Lord Effingham's time.

Bl. But it is very certain that it was kept shut over till the college's charter was brought into Virginia.

P. Were there no inhabitants upon the place?

Bl. None that had legal patents. The surveyors were all prohibited to survey there, and till that prohibition was taken off, we could not get a surveyor even to survey the college land.

C. Well, I think we have heard the most material things.

P. My lord, there is one thing Mr. Commissary said—in which I suppose he is in error—that is, he says Sir Edmund has twice suspended him from the council. Now, my lord, this last time he is not suspended, but only declared to be within the meaning of the act of parliament, as to the sitting in the general court. My Lord, the way I heard this thing represented, it was all Mr. Commissary's own doing, for the act being read in order to the swearing the naval officers, Mr. Blair himself stated the difficulty upon his hearing the act read, and desired the governor and council to give their opinion whether he should sit in the general court or not. The governor and council, as I was told, shifted the question, and said to Mr. Blair—Sir, in a few days you are to embark for England, what need we trouble ourselves with this question now? But Mr. Blair pretended some scruple of conscience, that he could not be satisfied till he had their opinion. The governor was so averse to

it, that he adjourned the council till the afternoon, designing the thing should drop, and that they should go upon other business. But Mr. Blair would come again in the afternoon, and would let them enter upon nothing till they had decided that; and so soon as they had decided that as to the general court, he was within the meaning of the act, Mr. Blair got up and went away from the council, though they told him he was not suspended. Nay, further, my lord, I am told that they afterwards sent for him to counsel, but that he positively refused to act in any council business. Sir, you know best (to Mr. Blair) whether it was thus or not.

Bl. Sir, it was quite otherwise. I never heard a story more altered.

C. How was it?

Bl. My lord, your grace may remember, how after I was suspended the first time, I was restored to the council by his Majesty's warrant. There was a clause in that warrant, my lord, which I did not at all deserve, that I should not only be restored to the council, but continue so, till it appeared to his Majesty that I had justly forfeited the good opinion he was pleased to say he had of me. This clause, my lord, every one construed to be a prohibition of all such suspensions of me for the future. At the same time with this warrant, there was sent into this country a new act of parliament of a posterior date to the warrant; I think the title of it is an act for preventing frauds in the plantation trade. If there was any thing in that act of parliament disabling me to be of the council, I ought never to have been received in again upon the warrant. But, my lord, they received me in and I stayed there near a year afterwards, till about the time that the accounts of the revenue were going to be laid before the council; for I must observe, my lord, that both times I was suspended just as these accounts were going to be laid before the council, and all the time I was of the council, I could never come by a sight of these accounts, and there is a reason for that, my lord. So, now the accounts being ready to be brought in, it was resolved, it seems, that I should be removed before they came in. In the morning, one of the gentlemen of the council told me, they designed that day to remove me from the council. When the council was met, the first thing that I saw was, that the clerk stood with the act of parliament in his hand ready to read, and the governor ordering him to read it after he had done.

Bl. It was pretty long, I confess, my lord; I started the first difficulty myself, in these words, sir, said I to the governor, upon the reading of this act, there occurs a doubt to me whether it be proper for me to sit in the general court or not—for the words of the act are these: provided always, that all places of trust in the courts of law, and

what relates to the treasury of the said Islands shall, from the date of this act, be in the hands of the native born subjects of England, Ireland, or of the said Islands. Your Excellency knows when I was first admitted to be of the council, I desired to be excused from sitting in the general court. Now, I shall be very glad if these words of the act of parliament disable me from it.

Upon this the governor desired them to consider how far the act of parliament affected me. In answer to this, as the matter had been said before, some said I could not be of the council, because the accounts of the government were laid before the council; and by the act of parliament I was disabled from any place of trust relating to the treasury. But, seeing the tendency of this, I argued against it that the being of the council was no place of trust as to the treasury, for all monies were issued out by the governor's warrant, even out of council; and though he advised with his council sometimes about money to be laid out, yet he might choose whether he would or not. Upon this, it was confessed by the governor himself, that the King has gone sometimes into the treasury and signed warrants without ever bringing the business before council.

From this they went to another topic, which gave better satisfaction, viz.: that the governor and council, by the constitution of the country, being the sole judges of the general court, I was consequently disabled likewise from being of the council—I desired them to consider the King's warrant for restoring me, and particularly that clause which orders me to continue in the council. The warrant was read, and the governor considering the bold stroke they were going to make, attempted first to shift it off on me, by persuading me to remove myself from the council. Mr. Commissary, says he, is agoing for England in a few days, and he might ease us of all this trouble if he pleased. My lord, though I understood the meaning of this, yet I gave no answer to it, till one Colonel Jennings, a great creature of the governor's, explained it thus—Yes, says Colonel Jennings, Mr. Commissary might ease us of all this trouble, if he would absent himself from the council for these few days that remain. Upon this, my lord, I made this answer to the governor, which I beseech your grace to take notice of, because it will clear the question whether I removed myself from the council, as it is said, or not. Sir, said I to the governor, I must beg your Excellency's pardon: the King has now twice commanded me to be here, and therefore, I shall not take it upon myself to remove myself from this board; though, at the same time, I shall readily submit to any sentence your Excellency and the council shall pronounce about it.

Upon this, my lord, the governor told the council that I had given them a very plain answer, which was that I should not remove myself, and therefore, said he, you must go upon it and give your opinion. Upon this, my lord, they discoursed the matter somewhere for making distinctions of the two several capacities of a judge and councillor—as to the first, they were of opinion that I was included within the act; but as to the second, they thought I was not included; and especially the King's warrant being so express, they thought it was better to let me sit for the three or four days remaining. But others, especially such as were upon the intrigue of business, who knew it was resolved I should not see the accounts, and saw no way to avoid my seeing of them, if I stayed upon the council, were very positive that I was included within the act of parliament as to the council too; because they alleged by the constitution of Virginia it was necessary that whosoever was of the council should sit in the general court. The governor, perceiving the division, whether it was that he doubted the vote would not go clearly of his side, or whether he was really afraid to go in the contradiction of the King's warrant, being disappointed of his aim of making me absent myself, adjourned the council till the afternoon; and, in the meantime, which was altogether unusual, sent and adjourned the general court too, where there were several causes depending, and the people were all met about their business; for, to make the king more odious of my side, he was resolved the general court should sit no more till this business about my being disabled, were decided, that so the odium of the delay of justice might lay upon me, who would not remove myself.

In the afternoon, my lord, it is said, I would come again to council, and would not let them go upon other business till they had decided this. I do assure your grace, I stayed in my chamber in the afternoon till the messenger of the council came to call me; he told me the governor and council were met and wanted my company—and if I had not gone then, a worse construction would have been put upon it. So soon as I came to the council, it is said, I hindered them to go upon other business. My lord, there was no occasion for that. The governor, without offering at any thing else, told them he hoped they had had their thoughts upon the question that was proposed to them, concerning Mr. Commissary, whether as to his being of the council, he were within the act of parliament or not. After the King's warrant was again read, and they had observed that it was of a prior date to the act of parliament, they concluded that the act was to take place before the warrant, and that I was incapacitated by the act from sitting either in council or in general court. Only one gentleman insisted still upon the distinction of the two several capacities. My lord, I was so far from removing myself, as it is said, that I did not offer to remove even after this vote, but had the impudence to sit still. The governor casting a strange look at me, asked me if I did not hear the vote of the council. Yes, sir, said I—I heard it, but your Excellency knows that we cannot suspend one another; I wait for your Excellency's sentence. No, said he, I'll pronounce no sentence. Then, sir, said I, I cannot remove. Upon this, my lord, he was strangely surprised; for this put him quite out of his measures, for as he had laid the thing first, I was to remove myself, and if that would not do, the council was to remove me; and either of these ways the governor would have

pretended to have been an unconcerned person. But when he saw that neither of these ways would do, and that I brought it home to himself; then he began to be very uneasy, and asked the council what he should do in this case. Colonel Jennings answered him, sir, your Excellency may signify to Mr. Commissary, that you have put the question to the council whether he is incapacitated by the act of parliament to act as one of the council, and that it is our unanimous opinion that he is. Upon this the governor stood up, and in the manner he uses to pronounce sentences, said, Mr. Commissary, I have put the question to this board how far you are included within the act of parliament, and it is our unanimous opinion that you are incapacitated from acting any further as one of the King's council. Sir, said I, I take this for a sentence; and with that made a bow, and came away.

P. But, sir, were you never sent for to the council after this?

Bl. Sir, I thank you for putting me in mind, for I should have forgot that. Truly I cannot tell whether I was sent for to the council again or not. The matter was thus:—It was about Tuesday, if I remember right, that I was removed from the council. They went on in their business, received their accounts and wrote their letters for England, and by Saturday they had done. On the Saturday, the governor sent Mr. Sherlock to me to my house in the country. He brought nothing in writing; the message he delivered by word of mouth was this, that his Excellency bid him tell me they had finished their business, and drawn their letters for England, and they desired that I should see them before they went. My lord, it was now Saturday afternoon and a very rainy day; I was to preach next day, and I confess I was very unwilling to stir abroad; but not knowing what use might be made of it if I did not go, I ordered my horse to be got ready, and went away to James Town in all the rain with Mr. Sherlock. When I came thither, I found the governor and council together, not in the council chamber, but in the secretary's chamber, which was at t'other end of the town, nor not set at a table about any business; so that whether they will call it a council or not, I cannot tell. When I came in, I told the governor I was come in obedience to his message, to see what service his Excellency had for me. He answered me, that having prepared their letters for England, they were willing that I should see them if I pleased. To this I replied, that if it was any council business, his Excellency knew I was declared incapable of acting in those affairs; but if they had any thing to say to me, in any other capacity, any thing relating to the clergy or college, for which I was concerned, I was ready to hear it. Yes, says he, there is in these letters something relating both to the clergy and college; please to hear them read. If you please, sir, said I; and upon that he called for chairs, and they all sat down, not at a table, but scattered about the room as we are now sitting. I did not offer to sit down, but the governor had a chair brought and would oblige me to sit too. Then he ordered the clerk to read the letters. If I remember right, there were two letters, one for the Secretary, my Lord Duke of Shrewsbury, another for the council of trade. The only thing I spake to in the letters was one thing relating to the clergy: for, speaking of an address presented to the governor by the clergy, they called it an address from part of the clergy of Virginia. Sir, I said to the clerk, I believe that is a mistake. It should be

an address from the clergy of Virginia. It was answered me by some of the council, that the clergy were not all there. I replied to this that they were all duly summoned, and many more than the major part were present; and all that were present signed the address. I asked them if it was their way, when any of the council was absent to call their orders, orders of council, or orders of part of the council; I told them too, it looked ill to say an order of part of the clergy, as if we were all in factions and parties. So, my lord, after some dispute, I gained the point, and had that word of the letter mended. There was a great deal of council business in the letters, but I spake to none of it. Now, my lord, whether this meeting will be called a council, or not, or whether it will be said that I acted in it or not, I cannot tell. I am apt to think if my suspension is not approved of in England, it will be said that I was not suspended, and that I was at a council afterwards, and that I spoke and acted in it. But if my suspension is approved of, that then this meeting is no council, and that my acting in it was only as Commissary, but not as one of the council.

P. Nay, certainly, sir, you are not suspended. Here is a copy of the sentence, and if it be compared with your first suspension, you will find the difference; and therefore, I should by all means advise that nothing may be said of this suspension, but that Mr. Commissary take his place at the council board, as if there had been no such thing; for the meaning of the sentence is only that as to the general court, he is within the meaning of the act of parliament.

L. Let us hear the sentence, (Mr. Byrd read it to this purpose, that the act for preventing of frauds, etc., being read in order to the swearing of the naval officers, Mr. Commissary Blair, of his own accord acknowledging himself to be a native of Scotland, proposing the doubt whether he was not disabled from sitting as a judge in the general court. The governor and council were of opinion that in regard to the constitution of Virginia, the general court was to be held by the governor and council; therefore, Mr. Commissary is within the meaning of the act.) Then the Bishop of London argued that these very words did bear that sense, that Mr. Blair was suspended from the council.

The Archbishop said he thought they implied more than a suspension, viz., an incapacitating. Mr. Povey, then blamed Sir Edmund for his short and obscure way of wording things. Then my Lord Archbishop said to this purpose to my Lord Bishop of London: Well, my lord, I think we have heard all the most material things of both sides; when your lordship is at leisure, we will appoint another day and get Mr. Blaithwait and Mr. Blair, and consider what we shall do upon all this.

L. When your lordship pleases.

P. My lord, give me leave to speak to one thing that Mr. Commissary mentioned, because it seems to reflect on the office, that is, Mr. Blair seems to insinuate that he could never come by a sight of the accounts all the while he was of the council. Now, my lord, I think it is for the King's service that every man should see the accounts and should have leave to make what observations he can against the passing of them. Here are the accounts (holding a paper in his hand), Mr. Blair may see them when he pleases.

Bl. Sir, I humbly thank you, it is a favor I could never have in Virginia (and with that he

stept to Mr. Povey, as it were to receive the accounts from him, and taking them in his hand, said), will you give me leave to peruse them, and I will carefully return them to you.

P. Sir, you may look upon them, but I cannot part with this, this is the record; but if you will call at the office, you may see them when you will.

Upon that Mr. Blair restoring them again, had returned to his chair. Then Mr. Byrd said something to this purpose:

By. My lord, this is a very uncharitable insinuation of Mr. Blair, about his being twice turned out of the council, just as the accounts were going to be brought before the council for the first time; it was a month after before the audit, and the second time, a week; and the accounts are so fairly stated, that I believe this will be found to be a very groundless imputation.

P. My lord, the accounts of Virginia are the easiest part of any accounts whatsoever. The revenues are but small, and the salaries are all established.

Bl. My lord, I am loth to enter into this subject, for it is now late and we have taken up too much of your grace's time already. But if I were to speak to the accounts, I should say something as considerable as all I have yet said, to make it appear what arts have been used to hinder the King's bounty to the clergy of Virginia, by the mismanagement of the the revenue; for, my lord, about five years ago, my Lord of London knows, there was a gift past by the late Queen in council of the quit rents of Virginia to the clergy for three years. But upon a great clamor that was raised, that if quit rents were disposed of that government would not be able to subsist, the King was prevailed upon to recall that grant, and so the clergy lost it. But, My lord, at the same time his Majesty recalled it, he was pleased to say that he would make a trial for three years, and if he found that the government could subsist without the quit rents, the clergy should have them still. To prevent this, my lord, from that time there has been such an unusual lessening and consumption of the revenue, that quit rents and all has enough to do to defray the charge. I would fain know why Sir Edmund Andros, presently after the news of this, passed an act for enlarging tobacco hogsheads, by which every hogshead holds, at least, a fifth part more than it did, and, consequently, the King's revenue of two shillings per hogshead, is a fifth part less than it was; that is six or seven hundred pounds a year. I would fain know why so much unnecessary charge to New York? Why so much for demolishing old forts and building a powder house and mounting of guns, and maintaining a cruising sloop upon another foot than was ordered by the lords of the treasury. In short, my lord, I would fain know what is become of all the money governor Nicholson left in bank, and how it comes to pass that the revenue is now over and above between four and five thousand pounds in debt. My lord, this is a strange thing in a time of peace; for it has been profound peace with us. My lord, the only true reason for all this was, to convince the King that that government could not subsist without the quit rents; though we know it subsisted very well before, upon the revenue of the two shillings a hogshead. But my lord, I will forbear till I have seen the accounts, only I am very well satisfied that I can discover a great mystery of iniquity in them.

C. Well, I think all the matters have been sufficiently discussed. My Lord (to the Bishop of

London), we must take a time to consider what is fit to be done upon all this. Then the Bishop of London and all the rest of us got up, and after some invitation of the Bishop of London to stay all night, which we did not accept of, we parted.

Practical Christianity.

EXCERPTA.

A MORAL DEMONSTRATION OF THE TRUTH OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

THIS discourse, of all the disputables in the world, shall require the fewest things to be granted; even nothing but what was evident; even nothing but the very subject of the question, viz. that there was such a man as Jesus Christ, that he pretended such things, and taught such doctrines: for he that will prove these things to be from God, must be allowed that they were from something or other.

But this postulate I do not ask for need, but for order's sake and art; for what the histories of that age reported as a public affair, as one of the most eminent transactions of the world, that which made so much noise, which caused so many changes, which occasioned so many wars, which divided so many hearts, which altered so many families, which procured so many deaths, which obtained so many laws in favor, and suffered so many rescripts in the disfavor of itself; that which was not done in a corner, but was thirty-three years and more in acting, which caused so many sects, and was opposed by so much art, and so much power, that it might not grow, which filled the world with noise, which effected such great changes in the bodies of men, by curing the diseased, and smiting the contumacious or the hypocrites, which drew so many eyes and filled so many tongues, and employed so many pens, and was the care and the question of the whole world at that time and immediately after; that which was consigned by public acts and records of courts, which was in the books of friends and enemies, which came accompanied and remarked with eclipses and stars, and prodigies of heaven and earth; that which the Jews, even in spite and against their wills, confessed, and which the witty adversaries intending to overthrow, could never so much as challenge of want of truth in matter of fact and story; that which they who are infinitely concerned that it should not be believed, or more that it had never been, do yet only labor to make it appear not to have been divine; certainly, this thing is so certain, that it was, that the defenders of it need not account it a kindness to have it presupposed; for never was any story in the world that had so many degrees of credibility, as the story of the person, life, and death of Jesus Christ; and if he had not been a true prophet, yet that he was in the world, and said and did such things cannot be denied; for even concerning Mahomet, we make no question but he was in the world, and led a great part of mankind after him, and what was less proved we infinitely believe; and what all men say and no man denies, and was notorious in itself,—of this we may make further inquiries whether it was all that which was pretended; for that it did make pretences, and was in the world, needs no further probation.—*Ep. Jeremy Taylor.*

CONVERSE WITH GOD.

In your retirement make frequent colloquies at short discourses between God and thy own soul; "Seven times a-day do I praise Thee; and in the night season also I thought upon Thee while I was waking." So did David; and every act of

complaint or thanksgiving, every act of rejoicing or mourning, every petition and every return of the heart in these intercourses, is a going to God, and appearing in his presence, and a representing Him present to thy spirit and thy necessity, And this was long since called by a person, "a building to God, a chapel in the heart." It reconciles Martha's employment with Mary's devotion, charity and religion, the necessities of our calling and the employments of devotion.—*lb.*

SICKNESS.

IN sickness the soul begins to dress herself for immortality. And first she unties the strings of vanity that made her upper garment cleave to the world and sit uneasy. She puts off the light and fantastic summer robe of lust and wanton appetite. Next to this the soul, by the help of sickness, knocks off the fetters of pride and self-complacencies. Then she draws the curtains and stops the light from coming in, and takes the pictures down; those fantastic images of self-love, and gay remembrances of vain opinion and popular noises. Then the spirit stoops into the sobrieties of humble thoughts, and feels corruptions chiding the forwardness of fancy, and allaying the vapor of conceit and factious opinions. Next to these, as the soul is undressing, she takes off the roughness of her great and little angers and animosities, and receives the oil of mercies and smooth forgiveness, fair interpretations and gentle answers, designs of reconciliation and Christian atonement, in their places.—*lb.*

IMPATIENCE.

I HAVE seen the rays of the sun or of the moon dash upon a brazen vessel, whose lips kissed the face of those waters that lodged within its bosom; but being turned back, and sent off with its smooth pretences on rougher waftings, it wandered about the room, and beat upon the roof and still doubled its heat and motion. So is sickness and sorrow entertained by an unquiet and discontented man. Nothing is more unreasonable than to entangle our spirits in wildness and amazements, like a partridge fluttering in a net, which she breaks not, though she breaks her wings.—*lb.*

CONSCIENCE.

THERE be five kinds of consciences on foot in the world: first, an *ignorant conscience*, which neither sees nor saith any thing, neither beholds the sins in a soul, nor reproves them. Secondly, the *flattering conscience*, whose speech is worse than silence itself, which, though seeing sin, soothes men in the committing thereof. Thirdly, the *seared conscience*, which hath neither sight, speech, nor sense, in men that are past feeling. Fourthly, a *wounded conscience*, frightened with sin. The last and best, is a *quiet and clear conscience*, pacified in Christ Jesus. Of these, the fourth is incomparably better than the three former, so that a wise man would not take a world to change with them. Yea, a *wounded conscience*, is rather painful, than sinful, an affliction, no offence, and is in the ready way at the next remove, to be turned into a quiet conscience.—*Rev. Thomas Fuller.*

SPIRITUAL TRANSFORMATION.

You have heard in the primitive church of a grain of faith removing mountains; and believe me, all miracles are not yet out-dated. The work of regeneration, the bestowing of a spiritual life on one dead in trespasses and sins, the making of a carcass walk, the natural old man to spring again and move spiritually, is as great a miracle

as that. Now the soul, in that it produces life and motion, the exercise of life in the body, is called a principle—that is, a spring or fountain of life; because all comes from it: in like manner, that which moves this soul, and enables it to do that which naturally it could not—that which gives it a new life, furnisheth it with spiritual powers to quell and subdue all carnal affections, this, I say, is called properly an inward principle; it doth not only outwardly assist us as an auxiliary at a dead lift, but is sown and planted in the regenerate heart, and there exercises dominion, executes judgment—and that commonly either by prison or punishment; it either fetters or expels all insolent, rebellious lusts.—*Hammond.*

ON THE LOVE OF OUR NEIGHBORS.

LOVING our neighbor “as ourselves,” doth import a rule, directing what kind of love we should bear and exercise toward him: or informing us that our charity doth consist in having the same affection of soul, and in performing the same acts of beneficence toward him, as we are ready by inclination, as we are wont in practice, to have or to perform toward ourselves, with full approbation of our judgment, and conscience, apprehending it just and reasonable so to do.

We cannot indeed better understand the nature of this duty, than by reflecting on the motions of our own heart, and observing the course of our demeanor towards ourselves, for thence infallibly we may be assured how we should stand affected, and how we should behave ourselves towards others.

This is a peculiar advantage of this rule, (inferred the excellent wisdom and goodness of Him who framed it,) that by it very easily and certainly we may discern all the specialities of our duty, without looking abroad, or having recourse to external instructions; so that by it we may be perfect lawgivers, and skilful judges, and faithful monitors to ourselves of what in any case we should do; for every one by internal experience knoweth what it is to love himself, every one is conscious how he useth to treat himself; each one consequently can prescribe and decide for himself what he ought to do towards his neighbor; so that we are not only taught of God, as the Apostle saith, “to love one another,” but taught of ourselves how to exercise that duty; whence our Lord doth propose the law of charity in these terms: “Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them, for this is the law and the prophets,” that is, unto this rule all the special precepts of charity proposed in holy Scriptures may be reduced.

Secondly, Loving our neighbor doth imply a sincere and earnest desire of his welfare and good of all kinds in due proportion; for it is a property of love that it would have its object most worthy of itself, and consequently that it should attain the best state whereof it is capable, and persist firm therein; to be fair and plump, to flourish and thrive without diminution or decay; this is plain to experience in respect to any other thing (a horse, a flower, or building, or any such thing,) which we pretend to love; wherefore charity should dispose us to be thus affected to our neighbor, so that we do not look on his condition or his affairs with an indifferent eye or cold heart, but are much concerned for him, and put forth hearty wishes for his interests: we should wish him adorned with all virtue, and accomplished with all worthy endowments of soul; we should wish him prosperous

success in all his designs, and a comfortable satisfaction of his desires; we should wish him with alacrity of mind to reap the fruits of his industry, and to enjoy the best accommodations of his life. Not formally and in compliment, as the mode is, but really, and with a cordial sense, on his undertaking any enterprise, we should wish him good speed; on any prosperous success of his endeavors, we should wish him joy; wherever he is going, whatever he is doing, we should wish him peace and the presence of God with him; we should tender his health, his safety, his quiet, his reputation, his wealth, his prosperity, in all respects: but especially with peculiar ardency, we should desire his final welfare and the happiness of his soul, that being incomparably his chief concern.—*Barrow.*

PROGRESS OF RELIGION IN THE SOUL.

Religion is a generous and noble thing in regard of its progress; it is perpetually carrying on that mind, in which it is once seated, toward perfection. Though the first appearance of it upon the souls of good men may be but as the wings of the morning spreading themselves upon the mountains, yet it is still rising higher and higher upon them, chasing away all the filthy mists and vapors of sin and wickedness before it, till it arrives to its meridian altitude. There is the strength and force of the Divinity in it; and though when it first enters into the minds of men, it may seem to be sown in weakness, yet it will raise itself in power. As Christ was, in his *bodily appearance*, He was still increasing in wisdom, and knowledge, and favor with God and man, until He was perfected in glory; so is He also in his *spiritual appearance* in the souls of men; and accordingly the New Testament does more than once distinguish of Christ in his several ages and degrees of growth in the souls of all true Christians. Good men are always walking on from strength to strength, till at last they see God in Zion. Religion, though it hath its infancy, yet it hath no old age: while it is in its minority, it is always *in motu*; but when it comes to its maturity and full age, it will always be *in quiete*, it is then always the same, and its years fail not, but it shall endure for ever. Holy and religious souls being once touched with an inward sense of Divine beauty and goodness, by a strong impress upon them are moved swiftly after God, and (as the Apostle expresses himself) “forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, they press toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus,” that so they may “attain to the resurrection of the dead.”—*Rev. John Smith.*

THE conceit of propriety hardens a man against many inconveniences, and addeth much to our pleasure. The mother abides many unquiet nights, many painful throes, and unpleasant savors of her child, upon this thought, It is my own. The indulgent father magnifies that in his own son, which he would scarce like in a stranger. The want of this to Godward makes us so subject to discontentment, and cooleth our delight in him, because we think of him aloof, as one in whom we are not interested. If we could think, It is my God that cheereth me with his presence, and blessings, while I prosper; that afflicteth me in love, when I am dejected; my Saviour is at God's right hand; my angels stand in his presence, it could not be but God's favor would be sweeter, his chastisements more easy, his benefits more effectual. I

am not my own, while God is not mine: and while he is mine, since I do possess him, I will enjoy him.—*Bishop Hall.*

NATURE is of her own inclination froward, importunately longing after that which is denied her; and scornful of what she may have. If it were appointed that we should live always upon earth, how extremely would we exclaim of weariness, and wish rather that we were not? Now it is appointed we shall live here but a while, and then give room to our successors, each one affects a kind of eternity upon earth. I will labor to tame this peevish and sullen humor of nature, and will like that best that must be.—*Id.*

ALL true earthly pleasure forsook man when he forsook his Creator; what honest and holy delight he took before in the dutiful services of the obsequious creatures; in the contemplation of that admirable variety, and strangeness of their properties; in seeing their sweet accordance with each other, and all with himself? Now most of our pleasure is to set one creature together by the cares with another, sporting our selves only with that deformity, which was bred through our own fault. Yea, there have been, that have delighted to see one man spill another's blood upon the sand, and have shouted for joy at the sight of that slaughter, which hath fallen out upon no other quarrel but the pleasure of the beholders: I doubt not but as we solace ourselves in the discord of the inferior creatures; so the evil spirits sport themselves in our dissensions. There are better qualities of the creature, which we pass over without pleasure. In recreations, I will choose those which are of best example and best use; seeking those by which I may not only be the merrier, but the better.—*Id.*

THERE is no want for which a man may not find a remedy in himself, Do I want riches? He that desires but little, cannot want much. Do I want friends? If I love God enough, and myself but enough, it matters not. Do I want health? If I want it but a little, and recover, I shall esteem it the more, because I wanted. If I be long sick and unrecoverably, I shall be the fitter and will-inger to die; and my pain is so much less sharp, by how much more it lingereth. Do I want maintenance? A little and coarse will content nature. Let my mind be no more ambitious than my back and belly, I can hardly complain of too little. Do I want sleep? I am going whither there is no use of sleep: where all rest, and sleep not. Do I want children? Many that have them, wish they wanted: It is better to be childless, than crossed with their miscarriage. Do I want learning? He hath none that saith he hath enough. The next way to get more, is to find thou wantest. There is remedy for all wants, in ourselves, saving only the want of grace: and that, a man cannot so much as see and complain that he wants, but from above.—*Id.*

EVERY virtuous action (like the Sun eclipsed,) hath a double shadow; according to the divers aspects of the beholders: one of glory, the other of envy. Glory follows upon good deserts; envy upon glory. He that is envied, may think himself well: for he that envies him, thinks him more than well: I know no vice in another, whereof a man may make so good and comfortable use to himself. There would be no shadow if there were no light.—*Id.*

THE light of the sun is neither parted nor diminished by being imparted to many several people and nations that behold it at one time; nor is the righteousness of the Sun of Righteousness either lessened to himself, or to several believers, by many partaking of it at once; it is wholly conferred upon each one of them, and remains whole in himself. Hence it is that not only Christ invites so liberally sinners to come to him, but even justified persons would so gladly draw all others to lay hold on this righteousness of their Redeemer, knowing well that if all the world were enriched by it, they themselves would be no whit the poorer."—*Leighton*.

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

MASSACHUSETTS.

BISHOP GRISWOLD, visited New Bedford on Sunday last, administered the communion in the forenoon, and preached in the afternoon, and confirmed twelve. The spiritual state of the parish is interesting at this time, partaking of the general interest in eternal things prevalent in New-
Bedford.—*Ch. Witness*.

NEW-YORK.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR VISITATION.

Tenth Sunday after Trinity, August 15, Hudson, Columbia county. Institution A. M. Confirmation P. M. Tuesday 17, Christ Church, Poughkeepsie, Dutchess co. 18, Pleasant Valley. 19, Lithgow. Saturday, 21, Patterson, Putnam county, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. Eleventh Sunday after Trinity, August 22, A. M., Pawlings, Dutchess county. St. Bartholomew the Apostle, Tuesday, 24, North Salem, Westchester county. 25, Somers. 26, Bedford. Saturday 28, Whiteplains.

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity, August 29, A. M., Rye; 4 P. M., Mamaroneck. 30, New Rochelle. 31, Eastchester. September 1, Westchester. 2, Morrisania.

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 26, St Mary's Church, New-York.

Where ordinations are to take place, the candidates are expected to see that the proper number of Presbyters, two at least, is in attendance.

The neighboring clergy are expected to make arrangements for officiating occasionally, prior to the Bishop's visitation, and preparing candidates for confirmation, if there be any, in such of the above named parishes as are vacant.

Any other services, during the same period, not inconsistent with punctually meeting the above appointments, will also be rendered with pleasure.—*Churchman*.

WESTERN NEW-YORK.

On Tuesday, 13th, Bishop De Lancey, confirmed five persons in St. Clement's Church, Weathersfield, Wyoming county. On Thursday, 15th, confirmed twelve persons in St. Mark's Church, Hunt's Hollow, Alleghany co. On Sunday, 18th, in St. Paul's Church, Angelica, fourteen were confirmed, and the infant child of the Rector baptized. On the 20th, in Olean, Cattaraugus co., six were confirmed, and an adult baptized. At Ellicottville, in the same county, on the 21st, the bishop confirmed six persons. On the 24th, one person was confirmed in Mayville, Chataugue co. The next day the bishop baptized one child and confirmed six persons in Westfield, in the same county. On the 26th, at Fredonia, confirmed fifteen persons. On the 27th, in Forrester, confirmed four persons. On the 29th, in Aurora, Erie co., baptized one adult and confirmed three persons. On Sunday, 1st inst., in St. Paul's Church, Buffalo, the bishop confirmed fourteen persons. In the afternoon of the same day, the bishop confirmed fifteen persons in the house occupied by the congregation of Trinity Church. The next day the bishop baptized one child, and confirmed seven persons in Christ Church, Lockport.

CHANGE.—The Rev. Charles B. Stout, having resigned his appointment as missionary at Clinton,

Michigan, and accepted the call of the Vestry of St. Peter's Church, Westfield, Chataugue county, Western New-York, to become their Rector, and entered upon his duties, requests that all letters and papers intended for him may be directed accordingly.—*Gospel Mess*.

PENNSYLVANIA.

ALL SAINT'S CHURCH, PARADISE.—On Saturday the 31st of July, this church was organized, by the election of John Yeates, Joel Lightner, Adam K. Witmer, Jacob Eshleman, Jun., Isaac Lightner, Jun., Jasper Yeates Conyngham and Redmond Conyngham, members of the vestry.

The Rev. Edward Y. Buchanan, was unanimously elected Rector. A committee was appointed to obtain a Charter that this Church may be represented in the next Convention of this Diocese.—*Ep. Rec*.

At a meeting of the Wardens and Vestry of Advent Church of the Northern Liberties, held on the evening of the 3d inst., the Rev. J. J. Kerr was unanimously elected Rector.

The Rev. Alfred Louderback has taken letters of dismission from this diocese to that of Western New-York.

Also, the Rev. James Lloyd Breck, from this diocese to the jurisdiction of Bishop Kemper.

The Rev. Matthias L. Forbes has been received into this diocese, from that of Mississippi, upon letters of dismission from Bishop Otey.

OHIO.

Bishop McIlvaine left home on a visitation of parishes in the northern part of the diocese, on the 13th. Of his progress we have heard as follows: On the 16th, he met the N. W. Convocation of the diocese at Elyria,—consecrated the new church in that place (a very neat and appropriate and well-finished building, reflecting great praise upon the energy and spirit of the small, but growing congregation, particularly as they have avoided debt in its erection,) administered confirmation to eight persons, and made a collection for Missionary purposes. Sunday, 18th, visited St. James', Painesville, confirmed five, and administered communion. Next day, preached at St. Michael's, Unionville, consecrated a neat little church, and confirmed one person. July 20th, visited St. Peter's, Ashtabula, and confirmed five. The day following at St. Matthew's, Plymouth, no confirmation, parish without a minister, a new church in progress.—*West. Epis. Ob*.

MISSOURI.

ORDINATION.—On Sunday the 18th ult., the Rt. Rev. Bishop Kemper held an ordination in St. Paul's (Mission) Church, at which time Mr. A. D. Corbin, of Kemper College, was admitted to the holy order of Deacons. The candidate was presented by the Rev. C. S. Hedges, late chaplain at Jefferson Barracks; and an appropriate sermon was delivered by the Rev. P. R. Minard, the Rector of the Church.—*Southern Churchman*.

MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.—The Rev. Orin Miller has resigned his appointment as a missionary in Ohio, to take charge of a parish in that state; the Rev. David Griffith has also resigned his office as missionary at Fort Leavenworth.

The Rev. F. H. L. Laird has been transferred from Buffalo Knob, Mo., to Logansport, Indiana;

and the Rev. Wm. Mitchell from Pine Bluff, Arkansas, to Washington, in the same state.

The Rev. Montgomery Schuyler has been appointed a missionary in Michigan, and assigned to Marshall; and the Rev. Wm. Adams, the Rev. J. L. Breck, and the Rev. J. H. Hobart, have also been appointed missionaries within Bishop Kemper's jurisdiction for Wisconsin.

Bristol, Indiana, has been added to Mishawaka, as part of a station instead of South Bend; and Albion, Illinois, has been recognized as a station.—*Spirit Missions*.

FOREIGN.—ENGLAND.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

(Continued from page 392.)

The Rev. Josiah Pratt, on coming forward to second the proposition, was greeted with general applause. He said, your Lordship has stated and the noble lord who followed you has also stated, the advantages which will accrue to the Society from the adoption of this proposition, in such a way as to render it unnecessary for me to enter further into that part of the subject. Had an attempt been made in the early days of this institution to fortell the time when such a proposition could be submitted with a certainty of success, it would have been fixed at a far more distant period than the present. I believe I cannot recognise a single person here now as being present at the formation of this Society, forty-one years ago; but having had some experience in the details of the society, I may say, and I am sure my beloved friends who have shared in the early labors of its operations will agree with me in saying, that we have felt the difficulty of bringing forward such a proposition. We have had great jealousy exercised over us from the beginning; and to have so many Right Rev. Prelates connected with the society at this period, and such a proposition made by a prelate of our Church, and of that diocese in which we are now assembled, is more than we could expect. But permit me to say, that if this arrangement were to be purchased by any sacrifice on the part of the Society I would certainly demur. (Hear, hear.) I have seriously and anxiously considered this question, for it is one that ought to be thoroughly examined, whether any sacrifice ought to be required of the Society, more especially at this time, when it is clear that the principles of this Society, which are those of an Apostolical Church properly carried out, have been the great cause of its success. (Hear.) If, then, the least sacrifice of those principles were to be made to effect this object, I would protest against it, and rather leave the Society than continue in it if it were to lose its great characteristic and vital principle of upholding the great doctrine of justification by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the ground of a sinner's hope for salvation with God. (Hear, hear.) But there is no fear of that. (Hear.) I think that the blessing of God is with the Society, and that he has led the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to see that they are called upon by their connexion with the Church to sanction its operations; and I hope this course will not be regarded as any sacrifice, but as a deference paid to the honor and usefulness of the Church, and to consistency of principle. (Hear.) If there were any danger in this step I would not only demur, but I would oppose it. But I see none; and therefore, if my opinion may be taken, it may be safely taken. I agree with some of my friends here, that this proceeding is a blessing vouchsafed from God in answer to prayer.

(Hear.) I will not detain the meeting by attempting to describe at length the advantages which will result from this arrangement. But must I say that it will afford us a ready answer to those who say that we have not the sanction of the heads of the Church, and to many in the kingdom who form scruples which influence their minds, and which were doubtless early formed, about the society, on the ground of its not having Episcopalian authority to rest upon. No doubt there are many conscientious members of the clergy and of the laity also who entertain those principles, and they will now be led to join this society. (Hear.) I foresee that we shall gain much support that will strengthen our hands from these quarters. But I do not want to gain a mere formality, a mere acquiescence, but the hearts of those who hold our vital principles, and who commit their proceedings to God in fervent prayer—those whose hearts are bent upon the conversion of the world. (Hear, hear.) I think these are some of the advantages which will result from the adoption of this proposition. I see no danger in it. On the contrary, I think it will lead to a firm determination on the part of the whole Church to establish a better conduct of our foreign missions and churches. I have had much correspondence with the Bishop of Calcutta on the difficulties under which our foreign missions and ecclesiastical establishments labor. He has seen and felt those difficulties. A question has arisen about the applicability of the canons of our church to foreign parts, and it is pretty generally understood and agreed upon that those canons cannot be applied to foreign parts, and a digest of them will become necessary, with a view to meet the case, but we have no hope of our Church acting as the Church of Scotland does; that is the only church establishment which acts as a missionary body. But since we cannot act as a missionary body, let us take this course, and at least be externally united in the work of missions. (Hear.) This is the only union that can be formed at present for that end, and I think it is a union which, with the blessing of God, will effect that end, and therefore I thank God that it has been proposed. ("Hear," and applause.)

The Rev. — Rice (of Fairford, Gloucester).—My Lords and Gentlemen,—It is with great reluctance that I venture to take any step which may interrupt the harmony of this meeting; but I cannot keep silence with regard to this motion, because I think we are bound to consider well what effect it may have upon the interests of the society. (Hear.) It is not that I have any indisposition to give all respect to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London that I do this; but looking at the present state of the Church, and seeing how divided it is in religious feelings and doctrinal views, some of which we cannot but feel to be in direct opposition to the Articles of the Church of England, and the principles for which our martyrs bled and died, (loud cries of hear, hear,) I feel myself bound to submit an amendment to this meeting, which I would rather do *pro forma*, in the first instance, in order that if by any explanation, my difficulties and doubts in relation to the proposition before the chair can be removed, I may have an opportunity of withdrawing that amendment. (Hear.) I repeat, that it is with great regret I take this step; but I have conversed with many clergymen in the country upon this subject, and I have come up to attend this meeting for the purpose of stating why I entertain a disinclination to agree to the proposition now made. I admit, however, that the committee are

more competent from their intimate knowledge of all the details of the institution, to form a more correct opinion upon the propriety of taking the course proposed than myself, and I shall be happy if they can remove my fears. (Hear.) A few weeks ago I visited Dr. Pusey at Oxford; he is a connexion of my own, and there is no man I esteem more highly as an individual, for I believe him to be a thoroughly conscientious person. Our conversation turned upon the Church Missionary Society, and he told me that he wished the Church Missionary Society would adopt the proposition now made as proposed by the Bishop of London. I was not then aware that it had been proposed; but if it involved no more than what it has been described to involve to-day, perhaps I should not feel so much difficulty about it. I think, however, that it goes much further. Dr. Pusey said to me, that the society ought to be constituted in this way: it should give the entire disposal of its affairs into the hands of the bishops, and that all we should do as a society was to furnish the funds. (Cries of "No, no," and "Hear, hear.") I said, that I for one could not agree to that as a subscriber, because, for one reason, it was a Church of England Society; and, for another reason, it sends forth missionaries to preach the gospel as our reformers preached it. (Hear, hear, and applause.) I therefore feel reluctant to agree to this proposition, because I know that these are the views of Dr. Pusey with regard to it, and because I know the influence he has in Oxford, and that a number of young men there have imbibed his principles, have grown up under his tuition, and will receive ordination under his sanction. Some of them go even further than he does: some of them go the whole length of the Tract No. 90, for they told me so themselves. If so, what will become of our society should it be placed under the influence of such men? (Hear, hear.) I cannot then but look forward with dread to the consequences of the adoption of this proposition. (Hear.) If we could always be sure of having such men to rule its destinies as the Bishop of Calcutta, if we could be certain of having men with the spirit of Heber to conduct its affairs, I should not fear. Indeed I have no fear with regard to those who now manage the institution. But we must look to the future. We must expect that in the course of events the clergy may be so trained on the question of Episcopal order, that they will carry out to the full length the principles of the Oxford Tracts; and what will be the consequence if you put the society at their disposal? (Hear, hear.) And then with regard to the dignity and authority which bishops are to maintain and exercise in foreign parts, though I am far from wishing to withdraw from them their Episcopal authority, for I could not be a consistent member of the Church of England if I wished such a thing, yet, let me ask, would you wish your missionaries who go forth to the Heathen to be placed exactly in the situation of curate in this country, whose license may be withdrawn without any reason being assigned for it? (Hear, hear.) But we cannot guard against that if this resolution be adopted. (Hear.) What I desire to see is this, that our missionaries who are episcopally ordained shall be in the same position abroad as our incumbents are at home. It is not that I wish any infringement whatever of the rubric or any deviation from the prayer-book. I give my unqualified assent in every respect to them, but I cannot but entertain great fears of the consequences of this resolution when I regard the state of the Church at present and the state of our

colonies also. I admit that as our colonies are so rapidly extending, and our bishops are going out to them, it is right that some alteration should take place, and that the committee of this society should not be the sole arbiters between the colonial bishops and the clergy, for that would make them a superior order of ecclesiastics. It appears to me that a slight alteration in the first part of the proposition would meet the difficulty. Instead of referring matters of difference to the whole Bench of Bishops, we should refer them to those bishops who are members of the society for the time being; and that would not be withdrawing the society from Episcopal authority. (Hear.) I cannot consent as an individual, to lay the society at the feet of those, some of whom, I cannot but feel, have hitherto looked unkindly upon us. (Hear.) The society has worked well, and this is a reason why we should consider well what we are about before we agree to give it up to those who have all along looked coldly and indifferently upon it. (Hear.) If a great machine had in all its parts worked with nice accuracy and successful effect, surely it would be a dangerous experiment to permit a wheel to be added by those who had manifested some ill-will towards the first inventors of that machine. Therefore it appears to me that we might justly say to the bishops, "My Lords, we give you all due honor as the ecclesiastical heads of the Church, but at the same time we think we are not asking too much in requesting you to show your love for this society by joining it, and then we will gladly follow you as our leaders." (Hear.) I do confess that I think it would be dangerous to leave the sole arbitration of our society to the whole Bench of Bishops, when we know that there is so much difference of opinion prevailing in high quarters upon doctrinal points. (Hear.) There is also an inconsistency in this resolution; it states, in the first part of it, that the decision of the bishops shall be final, and in a subsequent part, that the colonial bishops, or other ecclesiastical authorities, cannot be considered as bound by it. (Hear.)

The Noble Chairman here observed, that the resolution was not inconsistent, because it merely stated that the Colonial bishops would not be bound by the decision of the bishops at home unless they concurred.

The Rev. Mr. Rice.—If they do not concur they are not bound by it. How then can the decision be final?

The Noble Chairman.—The expression upon which the Rev. Gentleman comments is absolutely necessary. It is quite impossible that the colonial bishops can be bound by any voluntary agreement made by this society: they cannot be bound by a reference to which they are not a concurrent party. That is the only meaning of the expression. We agree to be bound by it, but that does not bind them, unless they shall agree also.

The Rev. Mr. Rice.—I thank your Lordship for that explanation, but still I think the resolution leaves us in a difficulty. But instead of pressing this point, I wish rather to move my amendment *pro forma*; and perhaps it may be shown that it is impracticable to adopt it. I do not at present see how that can be the case. We ought to consider what will be the effect of the resolution upon the society. Knowing that there is a powerful party in the Church which entertains most erroneous sentiments, I have felt called upon, much against my inclination and feelings, because this is the first time I have addressed a meeting of

this kind, to submit this amendment. It does appear to me, looking at the Church Pastoral-Aid Society, which I consider as one of the greatest blessings enjoyed by the Church of England, (applause), and knowing that the gentlemen at Oxford have tried to destroy that society, in the same way as they strove to destroy this, by trying to make out, as they did two years ago, that it is not a Church of England Society; and are we willing to admit that? (Cries of "no, no.") No, we cannot admit anything of the sort. But looking to these movements, and to the present state of things, as well as to the consequences likely to arise from the adoption of this proposition, inasmuch as it may induce persons to come into the society with a view of gaining power over it, I must press my amendment. Look at the immense funds of this society; how greatly have they increased within a few years! They have reached to the amount of between 90,000*l.* and 100,000*l.* It appears that the Oxford gentlemen having first tried to destroy the society, and failed in that object, are now endeavoring to gain it over to their own party. (Cries of "no, no.")

The Rev. E. Bickersteth.—They have nothing to do with it.

The Rev. Mr. Rice.—I believe they have nothing to do with it at present. But I cannot help fearing that they may have in future times. (Hear.) Therefore it is that I have ventured to submit this amendment, to which I feel myself inadequate to do full justice. I would propose that the latter part of the first paragraph should stand thus:—"shall be referred to such of the archbishops and bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland as may for the time being be members of this Society," &c.

The Noble Chairman.—I wish merely to make one remark as to the formal part of the resolution. The meeting will probably recollect, that in stating to them the proceedings which had taken place between the Committee and the Lord Bishop of London, I said that his Lordship had made a proposition to the Committee, stating, that upon the society accepting that proposition, and making it a fundamental law of the society, and also upon the condition of the Society for Propagating the Gospel doing the same thing, he and the Archbishop of Canterbury would become members of the society. It is also important to bear in mind, that the amendment goes to alter the proposition of the Bishop of London, and not the comment upon it, so that, if the meeting agree to the amendment, which I trust they will not, for I verily believe that it is not a desirable one, they would do that which they are not competent to do. If you adopt the amended form of the proposition made by the Bishop of London, that would be an independent act of the society, quite distinct and disconnected from the negotiation with the Bishop of London. (Hear.) I will also add, that, in my humble opinion, the object of the Bishop of London was to have one positive rule which the Committee were of opinion would be an extremely useful rule, and an object of great importance, not only to the society itself, but to the Church at large. (Hear.) Therefore I should grieve if any alteration were made in that rule which would render it inapplicable to the object intended to be effected, and unacceptable to the Bishop of London. (Hear.)

The Rev. S. Glynn.—In seconding this amendment, I would observe, first, that I believe the Committee are not aware of the very strong feeling which exists amongst many individuals in the country upon the proposition which has been made

this day. I have spoken to many persons about it, and they do doubt exceedingly, whether in the present state of the Church, and in the times in which we live, such a proposition should be acceded to. With regard to immediate consequences, I fully admit that the Committee have so conducted the affairs of the society for the last ten years that I have great confidence in their management, and have no fears while they continue that management; but I cannot conceal from myself what may happen when we are gone to our rest, and that if this resolution is carried it may bring in an influx of men, who no doubt conscientiously feel as they do, but who, from all I have heard and all I could read, especially the work of Bishop McIlvaine, are under the influence of gross errors. What then, I say, is likely to be the influence of that particular body of men now existing in our Church, should they hereafter have any control over this institution? Therefore, looking to consequences, for I quite feel the force of the remarks of the Rev. Gentleman who moved the amendment, for the present I have no fears. I cannot conceal from myself that the alteration now proposed may produce altogether a new system, by causing the introduction into the Committee and the society of a large body of men who do not feel, upon the doctrines and articles of the Church, as the great mass of the supporters of this society do; and therefore this proposition may materially affect the usefulness of the missionaries sent out by this society. (Hear, hear.) I do not wish to urge my own opinion only; I am sure I speak the feelings of many who have said to me, "What would be the use of this Missionary Society, if the time must come when we are to send out ministers who do not preach Christ crucified, and justification through his righteousness, as the only way of salvation?" (Hear, hear.) I feel thankful to my Rev. friend for bringing forward this amendment; but coming here as an humble minister from the country to object to this resolution, I feel also that it would almost appear that we were objecting to individuals as well as to measures. But I can assure the meeting that I join in every expression of respect uttered this day towards the Primate of this country and the Bishop of London; therefore I trust the meeting will bear with me. The sentiments I have advanced are the sentiments of those who have the interests of the society deeply at heart, and these opinions are not brought forward to cripple the society, or to throw any obstacle in the way of the proper consideration of this most important question. Letters have been sent to the Committee expressive of these objections, and requesting them not to come to a decision upon this subject without looking at future consequences. (Hear.) I say, that the Church Missionary Society has been blessed among thousands in foreign lands; and has it not been the rallying-point of that body in the Church of England who have been led out through grace to preach Christ Jesus, and him crucified? ("Hear," and applause.) With all deference to my superiors, I ask, May not a bishop of our Church err? Is he not a fallible man like ourselves? Has he not all that corruption of human nature which may cause him not to learn and to reject the doctrines of truth, unless the grace of God put it into his heart to embrace them? (Hear.) And then look at the case of our missionaries. As our friend has observed, would you wish to place them in the same position as the stipendiary curates in this country, who, if they do not feel on particular points as the heads of the Church do, suffer materially in their usefulness? (Hear,

hear.) I have known instances in my own diocese some years ago—not, certainly, under my present excellent diocesan—in which a great degree of hinderance, I will not say of arbitrary feeling, was brought to bear upon such individuals. (Hear.) For these reasons, then, I beg to second the amendment; and though I do not say that the Bishop of London has not proposed a resolution which does his Lordship honor, I am compelled to object to it on account of the effect it may have with regard to other persons; and I could not hold up my hand against it without attempting in some measure to explain my reasons for objecting to it. (Hear, hear.)

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Literary.

[For the Church Record.]

OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

NUMBER XXVI.

QUARLES.

The author of the "Emblems" is truly a "neglected" Poet. The "sometimes darling" of the "plebeian judgments" is, now, known to most readers only by name, as one of the victims of Pope's satire. But like certain others of those on whom Pope wrote rather as a malignant foe than as a keen critic, Quarles has strong grounds of desert to prefer as a claim on our attention. Cibber was no less a brilliant comic writer than Quarles was a deep and earnest religious Poet, yet both are embalmed in the Dunciad:—a monument of elaborate malice and, in their cases, at least, of unjust satire.

The best argument for the worth of any man is a knowledge of his intimate associates and assured friends; next to that, the strongest proof is, the good report of those good men amongst his contemporaries, to whom he was personally unknown, and whose disinterested applause is the fruit of his irreproachable life and fair actions. If we allow this, we must concede the noblest qualities of the man, and the genius of the Poet, to one who could unite the suffrages of such men, in his favor, as Drayton the Poet, Fuller the Church Historian, Dr., a son of Bishop Aymer, Dr. Hammond, and Archbishop Usher. His wife, also, was his warm eulogist, and she should have known his domestic character best. It is delightful, from time to time, to read the affectionate memorials of the wives and daughters of men of genius. We have lately seen pleasing instances of this kind in the wife of Shelly, and the daughter of Coleridge; of a similar nature, is the sisterly regard for the fame of her admirable brother, in the case of Mary Lamb.

Francis Quarles was descended from a respectable family, of some wealth and local reputation. At an early age, he entered the University of Cambridge, where he is said to have surpassed all his equals, and was graduated from the same college at which Milton and Henry More, the Platonist, studied. This fact is alluded to, in a line, by George Dyer, the friend of Charles Lamb, in his History of Cambridge. On leaving college, Quarles read Law, for the same reason that Shelly walked the Hospitals, rather to learn how to defend the rights, as the greater Poet, to save the lives, of his fellow-creatures, than from any motives of profit or advantage. Though a lover of quiet and of a retired way of life, yet so strong was his loyalty and almost romantic devotion to the most celebrated woman of her day, that he became cup-bearer to the Queen of Hungary. We next hear of Quarles, as secretary to Archbishop Usher, who valued him very highly. At the breaking out of the rebellion,

Quarles left Ireland for London, where, at the request of the Earl of Dorset, he was created "City's Chronologer," an office supposed to resemble that of Master of Ceremonies. Quarles held this situation until his death.

We have selected the following contemporary notices of our Poet. Fuller says of him, that if Quarles had been contemporary with Plato, he would not only have allowed him to live, but also advanced him to an office in his commonwealth. The same quaint author, speaks of Quarles making Mount Zion, his Parnassus; and allows him the just praise of uttering strains of a very different character from those the Poets generally gave birth to, in his time. Aubrey adds, in a sentence, to a notice of some other worthy, "Mr. Quarles was a very good man." One of the nearest friends of Quarles was Doctor Aylmer, Archdeacon of London, "a great favorer and fast friend to the Muses," who died of the plague, 1625. We introduce this name, for the sake of the anecdotes connected with it. Being asked, on his death-bed, how he felt, he exclaimed, "I thank God, heart-whole." He also declared, in that solemn hour, that "his own eyes" had ever been "his overseers," and it is recorded that he "shut his own eyes with his own hands."

A man and poet, possessed of such friends, in such an age, can hardly deserve the contempt of modern wittlings, who affect to speak of "the trash" of Quarles. There is undoubtedly a great proportion of worthless poetry in his works, but there is also a genuine vein. Quarles was often quaint; sometimes, coarse; never weak or effeminate. He has sublimity with his harshness; force, with his distortion; energy, with his extravagance. The Muse of Quarles is dedicated wholly to the service of Religion. He wrote none but devotional poetry, and all his strains are inspired by a sincere, affectionate piety.

His "*Emblems*" is his chief work, a species of illustrated poetry and piety, that forms a rather heterogeneous mixture. Some years ago we had a copy in our possession, the only one we ever met with. From our recollection of that, we should infer it to be a work, in which it is hard to tell whether piety or an absurdity of pictorial conception predominate. The *Hieroglyphics*, "an Egyptian dish dressed after an English fashion," forms an appropriate comparison-piece to the *Emblems*. The eccentricities of Quarles' fancy are here paralleled by the eccentricities of his measure. We shall, hereafter, give some specimens of the curious extravagances into which the forms of Poetry were allowed to run about this period.

From the "Religious Poetry of the Seventeenth Century," we select the most favorable specimens of the best manner of Quarles. These are sententious and dogmatical: full of thought and serious feeling. The style is as hard as enamel and as polished; pointed to conciseness, and weighty with the dignity of religious truth.

VANITY OF THE WORLD.

False world, thou ly'st: thou canst not lend
The least delight:
Thy favors cannot gain a friend,
They are so slight:
Thy morning pleasures make an end
To please at night:
Poor are the wants that thou supply'st
And yet thou vaunt'st, and yet thou vy'st
With heaven; fond earth, thou boasts; false world
thou ly'st.

Thy babbling tongue tells golden tales
Of endless treasure:
Thy bounty offers easy gains
Of lasting pleasure;
Thou ask'st the conscience what she ails,
And swear'st to ease her:

There's none can want where thou supply'st:
There's none can give where thou deny'st.
Alas! fond world, thou boasts; false world, thou ly'st.

What well-advised ear regards
What earth can say?
Thy words are gold, but thy rewards
Are painted clay:
Thy cunning can but pack the cards,
Thou canst not play:
Thy game at makest, still thou ay'st;
If seen, and then revy'd, deny'st:
Thou art not what thou seem'st, false world, thou ly'st.

Thy tinsel bosom seems a mint,
Of new-coined treasure;
A paradise, that has no sin at;
No change, no measure;
A painted cask, but nothing in't,
Nor wealth, nor pleasure;
Vain earth! that falsely that comply'st
With man; vain man! that thou rely'st
On earth; vain man, thou dot'st; vain earth, thou
ly'st.

What mean dull souls, in this high measure,
To haberdash
In earth's base wares, whose greatest treasure
Is dross and trash?
The height of whose enchanting pleasure
Is but a flash?
Are these the goods that thou supply'st
Us mortals with? Are these the highest?
Can these bring cordial peace? false world thou ly'st.

DELIGHT IN GOD ONLY.

I love (and have some cause to love) the earth:
She is my Maker's creature; therefore good:
She is my mother, for she gave me birth;
She is my tender nurse; she gives me food;
But what's a creature, Lord, compar'd with thee?
Or what's my mother, or my nurse to me?

I love the air: her dainty sweets refresh
My drooping soul; and to new sweets invite me;
Her shrill mouth'd quire sustains me with their flesh,
And with their polyphonia notes delight me:
But what's the air or all the sweets that she
Can bless my soul withal, compare to Thee?

I love the sea: she is my fellow-creature,
My careful purveyor; she provides me store:
She walls me round; she makes my diet greater;
She waits my treasure from a foreign shore:
But, Lord, of oceans, when compar'd with Thee,
What is the ocean, or her wealth to me?

To heav'n's high city I direct my journey,
Whose spangled suburbs entertain mine eye;
Mine eye, by contemplation's great attorney,
Transcends the crystal pavement of the sky:
But, what is heav'n, great God, compar'd to Thee?
Without Thy presence heav'n's no heaven to me.

Without Thy presence earth gives no reflection;
Without Thy presence sea affords no treasure;
Without Thy presence air's a rank infection;
Without Thy presence heav'n itself no pleasure:
If not possess'd, if not enjoy'd in Thee,
What's earth, or sea, or air, or heav'n to me?

The highest honor, that the world can boast,
Are subjects far too low for my desire;
The brightest beams of glory are (at most),
But dying sparkles of Thy living fire:
The loudest flames that earth can kindle, be
But nightly glow-worms if compar'd to Thee.

Without Thy presence, wealth is bags of cares;
Wisdom, but folly; joy, disquiet—sadness:
Friendship is treason, and delights are snares;
Pleasures but pain, and mirth but pleasing madness;
Without Thee, Lord, things be not what they be,
Nor have they being, when compar'd with Thee.

In having all things, and not Thee, what have I?
Not having Thee, what have my labors got?
Let me enjoy but Thee, what further crave I?
And having Thee alone, what have I not?
I wish nor sea, nor land; nor would I be
Possess'd of heav'n, heav'n unpossess'd of Thee.

TO SIR JULIUS CÆSAR, MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

The high perfections, wherewith heav'n does please
To crown our transitory days, are these:
Goods well possessed, and not possessing Thee;
A faithful friend, equal in love, degree;
Lands fruitful, and not conscious of a curse;
A boastless hand; a charitable purse;
A smiling conscience; a contented mind;
A sober knowledge, with true wisdom joined:
A breast well temper'd; diet without art,
Surfeit, or harm; a wisely simple heart;
Pastimes ingenuous, lawful, manly sparing;
A spirit not contentious, rash, but daring;
A body healthful, sound, and fit for labor;
A house well order'd, and an equal neighbor;
A prudent wife, and constant to the roof;
Sober, but yet not sad, and fair enough;
Sleep seasonable, moderate, and secure;
Actions heroic, constant, blameless, pure;
A life as long as fair; and when expir'd,
A glorious death, unfeared as undesir'd.

Wilmott, the biographer of Quarles, speaks of passages in his earlier poems, as reading "like Fragments from an uncorrected copy of Pope's Essay on Man;" with native strength and roughness, but destitute of the polish and harmony of the later poet. Of the poem above last quoted, we would say even more than this. We think it equal to the second rate passages of Pope, and superior to the imitations of his followers, better, for instance, than Hayley could have done.

In his analysis of Quarles, Mr. Wilmott has meted out to him, exact justice. He concludes his criticism, with this language—"There was nothing effeminate in his manners or disposition; he was often ungraceful, but never weak. . . . His eccentricity was the ruin of his genius; he offered up the most beautiful offspring of his imagination, without remorse, to this misshapen idol. . . . His pencil rather 'dashed' than 'drew,' and he wanted the taste and patience to finish his pictures. He was sublime and vulgar at the impulse of the moment. Sometimes, however, images of great delicacy fell unconsciously from his pen." Quarles' prose is excellent: his Enchiridion is worthy of Epictetus. A consideration of that and of Warwick's spare minutes, with which it may be fitly associated, we reserve for a future criticism.

J.

Miscellaneous.

BISHOP KENRICK'S LETTER ON CHRISTIAN UNION, with the answers of Bishops Doane, Chase and Whittingham.

What would have been thought in our communion a few years ago, had it then been predicted that we should see the day when a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church would seriously address a letter to our Bishops, inviting them to union; and that such invitation would avowedly be made on the ground of our departure from the principles of the Reformation and of our approximation to Romanism? Another and graver question may well be asked:—to whom are we indebted for the exhibition of this spirit of fraternization with Rome?—who is it that encourages Bishop Kenrick in the thought or expectation that our union with the Church of Rome is probable or practicable? Bishop Kenrick informs us that we are to attribute his letter to the language used by some of the writers of the Oxford Tracts. It is not long since we expressed the opinion with reference to the productions of this school, that the true question involved was the very simple one of Protestantism or Popery. We repeat the opinion. We are far from saying that all those who approve of the Oxford writings either know or believe that they are verging toward Rome. Many of them do not. Many of them suppose that they are but adhering to that which is primitive and Catholic, and in some particulars so they are; but (in our view at least) there are also points held that are neither primitive nor Catholic, but which are peculiarities of Rome.

As to Bishop Kenrick's letter, it seems to have been viewed in different lights by those of our Bishops who have noticed it. Bishop Doane treats it as if it were palpably insincere, a regular politico-ecclesiastical ruse, or, to speak in the vernacular, an insult wrapped up in a lie. Bishop Whittingham also seems to entertain some doubts of the sincerity of the Bishop of Arath; while Bishop Chase, without troubling himself about the honesty of the writer who addresses him, takes up his proposition for union, and in a few words in-

forms him that so far from wishing or expecting union, his desire is to be still further removed from the paternal embraces of his volunteer correspondent.

For ourselves, we have never been able yet to see the evidences of Bishop Kenrick's insincerity, so confidently assumed by Bishop Doane. It certainly is not apparent on the face of the letter itself. It is indeed easy to cry out, "the old jesuitical cunning," "the old trick," etc., but we confess (though our faith in the existence of jesuitical cunning is quite strong,) that we are not sure Bishop Kenrick's letter is a specimen of it. The truth of the matter may be put in few words. Bishop K. professes to find in the Oxford tract writers evidences so strong of an approximation to Romanism, that he ventures to hint at efforts to consummate a union; and he does this in respectful language. Those who have committed themselves by an unqualified defence and support of the tracts, somewhat startled at this movement of a Romish bishop, and not willing to admit in the face of the whole Church, that they are sustaining views that lead to the support of what the Church most pointedly condemns, have but one of two courses to pursue. They must either show that Bishop K. is entirely mistaken in his interpretation of the Tract writers; or they must charge him with insincerity in pretending to think that the Oxford writings tend to the support of Rome. As to the first of these courses, it is unsafe, for hundreds who have no sympathy with Bishop K.'s peculiar religious opinions, but are diametrically opposed to them, agree with him entirely as to the tendency of the writings. Surely it is not in their case, "the old jesuitical cunning." Protestants have nothing to gain by the fraudulent trickery of falsely representing their own brethren to be verging toward popery. Beside, we really cannot perceive any very deep cunning in the imputed insincerity of Bishop K. We rather think cunning would dictate silence, and thus allay Protestant apprehension and disarm suspicion; and so in this case it would, if Bishop K. and his brethren did not feel perfectly strong in the truth of the views they have taken of the Oxford writings.

And why should they not feel strong? It is idle to pretend that the language used by some who are ranked among Protestants, (though we suppose they would now disclaim the name,) does not fully justify the Romanist in his conclusion. Our readers shall judge from a specimen at hand. A writer under the signature of "Catholicus," in the "Churchman," publishes his views on "the true Catholic ground." "The New-York Freeman's Journal," a Roman Catholic print, republishes "Catholicus," with its comments, as follows.

"THE TRUE CATHOLIC GROUND.—The last No. of the Churchman contains another communication from *Catholicus* which bears testimony to some of the most prominent doctrines and institutions of the Catholic Church, and admits their divine origin and salutary tendency. The editor of the Churchman certifies that 'those articles of Catholicus contain no opinions that may not be honestly entertained and avowed by any members of the (Protestant Episcopal) Church.' Episcopalians, therefore, may with Catholicus, honestly entertain and avow their belief in 'the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist,'—'not in the timid half-explained view' of Faber and other writers of that class,—'but, as St. Cyprian, in common with the Church,' understood it: they may also believe that the Priests of the New Tes-

tament 'are empowered to make the body and blood of Christ,' and that 'the great, ever-living sacrifice itself doth enliven our souls and the souls of the whole Church (the faithful) departed, now being purified in Hades,' or Purgatory. They may also profess their firm conviction that by omitting 'the frequent celebrations of these purifying and justifying mysteries, Episcopalians omit the chief service of God; and consequently, that 'until the daily sacrifice is restored, the daily spirit of holiness will be wanting.' In like manner they may honestly avow the Catholic doctrine of 'the purification of the soul after death;' the use of 'prayers for the dead;' 'the necessity of good works, penance, fasting, etc., in a man's being justified;' 'the merits of Christ really cleansing and pardoning him; and the Holy Ghost dwelling in him to make him righteous,' etc. Though all these doctrines were rejected by the authors of the 'Reformation,' *Catholicus* sets them down as Catholic verities, and pronounces a sweeping sentence of condemnation on 'the unholy corruptions of the continental Reformation.' Yet the Churchman assures us that Catholicus does not broach heterodox opinions— but rather such as any members of the Episcopal Church may honestly entertain and avow. We hope those truly Catholic doctrines do prevail among Episcopalians, and that they will become general among High-Churchmen, we confidently anticipate, notwithstanding the senseless cry of 'Popery,' which Dr. McIlvaine and other *Low-Churchmen* (low in every sense of the word) have attempted to raise. We might take exception to certain expressions in the subjoined communications of Catholicus, but he will learn better things as he advances on 'the true Catholic ground,' where he desires to rest his Catholic claims. The idea of confuting Romanism by adopting the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as '*Catholicus*' does in opposition to so many 'unholy corruptions of the continental Reformation,' is certainly rather a novel mode of controversial tactics, and we shall be happy to see him prosecute his zealous efforts, until he finally succeeds in entering the citadel of Catholic unity, and plants his banner among the true followers and faithful allies of the Apostolic See.

From the Churchman.

THE TRUE CATHOLIC GROUND.—NO. IV.

If it had not been done more than once by able pens, we would now proceed to show the catholicity of some of the other points we hinted at, as confuting Romanism by their correct exhibition: such as a real presence of the Christ who is in heaven at the right hand of God, in the eucharist; the necessity of good works, penance, fasting, etc., in a man's being justified; the merits of Christ really cleansing and pardoning him; and the Holy Spirit dwelling in him to make him righteous. St. Cyprian speaks of justification and sanctification as synonymous. *Serm. vi. De Orati. Dom.* But we do not desire to enter at all upon this point, so daily controverted as it is. With regard to the eucharist we will only say, that the language of the holy fathers of the fourth century cannot be mistaken; and that St. Cyprian, in the third, in his *Sermo de Cæna Domini*, speaks of our being forbidden in the Old Testament to eat blood, but yet commanded in the new to drink it: and reconciles the seeming contradiction by showing the difference between the perishable animal's blood and the blood of the ever-living Christ. This shows that he, in common with the Church, held no timid, explained away view, but

conceived of something *real*: while it also tells against the impious withholding of the cup from the laity, as does also the fact that infants were admitted to the cup, *Sermo de Lapsis*, and *Liber Primus adversus Judæos*,) and indeed the communion of children was only forbidden from the twelfth century, although it continued in some places to the 15th. (Geisler, II. p. 333 and references.) We would beg leave here, in connection with this point, to refer to Rev. Mr. Crösthwaite's "*Communion Fidelium*," (Oxford, 1841,) in which he clearly proves what is the correct mode of administering the elements. St. Cyprian also speaks of the priest daily offering the eucharistic sacrifice, (*Epis. II.* and several other places,) which was done in the Church until the *unholy corruptions of the Continental Reformation* were brought in; and how can we expect to be vigorous, holy and active, as a Church, when we neglect the chief service of God? The Jews indeed, with only their dumb types of the great sacrifice, were nevertheless to offer them daily, while we who have the *ever-living sacrifice itself*, who have, in the good providence of God, the apostolically descended hands which are *empowered to make the body and blood of Christ*,—we will have our sacrifice, which doth enliven our souls and the souls of the whole Church departed, *now being purified in Hades*, but one little dozen times a twelvemonth! Oh! for that primitive spirit, when the faithful hastened even at the risk of life and torture, to partake of the flesh and blood of their beloved Master! And what shame upon us, that even when the accumulation of festivals presents an opportunity for the more frequent celebration of these *purifying and justifying mysteries*, we omit the chief service of God, lest it be too great a tax upon our prayerfulness, examination and holiness, to prepare for their reception! The omission of the eucharist on Whitsunday, was anciently (and is now in spirit, by the English Church) deemed almost schismatically sinful. Until the daily sacrifice is restored, the daily spirit of holiness in all its power will be wanting. When we pray "give us this day our daily bread," we are praying for such restoration; for it is not by bread alone we live, and none who eat not the flesh and drink not the blood of the Son of Man, have life in them; it is by that bread's daily influence and persevering efficacy that we live; and if we are praying for those spiritual benefits which we receive through Christ's mediation, when we offer that petition, surely we are praying also for the chief means by which they are received.

"With regard to the *purification of the faithful after death*, there is so much in the holy fathers, and it is so clearly Catholic within the first six ages, that any discussion of it would require a complete dissertation; and so likewise with *prayers for the dead*, which Archbishop Usher has completely settled."

Now we leave it to any candid man to say whether the editor of the Journal has said one word more as to doctrines, than the language of Catholicus justifies.

As to the answers to Bishop Kenrick, we like Bishop Doane's least. It is wanting in dignity, and we must say its spirit did not altogether please us. Still it contains much that is very satisfactory in the way of answer to some of the Bishop of Arath's statements and opinions. One portion of the Bishop's remarks deserves especial attention. He boldly, and, as we think, truly, tells the Bishop of Arath in the outset, that he is a schismatical

intruder; and thus denies his right to the office which he claims:

"Nay: by what right do you, the inferior and vassal of the Pope, approach us, Bishops of the Catholic Church of Christ; and so—saving the reverence due to occupancy of the see in which Apostles labored, preached and died—the equals of the Bishop of Rome; and, therefore, your superiors? We are no Vicars of the Apostolic See, as you are; but Vicars of the Lord of heaven and earth. We claim no personal regard, but humbly wash your feet as well becomes us. But if you touch our office, if you trench upon our trust, which we received from Christ, and hold for Him and Him alone, we plainly say to you, that, if the Bishop of Rome, our fellow-bishop, be your superior, you may choose what name or place you will, but Bishops, in the Catholic sense, as we are, we allow you not to be."

The tone of Bishop Whittingham's letter, we think, is excellent, and well does he take the important distinction between that which is peculiarly "Roman," and that which is truly "Catholic." Well does he point out the dexterity with which the adherents of the Pope seek to unite the two, and then claim for the first, that which truly belongs to the last. For that which is indeed Catholic, every well informed Christian will contend, but we think with Bishop W., that those of our communion at least, need not go to Rome to find it.

As to Bishop Chase's letter, we have already printed it entire in a previous number. It is like most articles from the Bishop's pen, short, very much to the purpose, plain, and tinctured with a remarkably strong infusion of practical good sense. The Bishop enters into no controversy about Mr. Newman's opinions, Oxford tendencies, etc., but simply considering the letter of Bishop K. as an invitation to become a Roman Catholic, he respectfully declines, informing him at the same time, that his mind has long been made up on the point, and thus intimates his wish to be no further troubled on the subject.

"You are pleased to say, that 'you cannot come beyond the precincts of the (Romish) Church, to reach us in our present position; and therefore, from afar, you raise your voice' to make us hear your entreaties to come to the Pope.

"Now, Rt. Rev. Sir, we would spare you the trouble of raising your voice any higher, by answering forthwith that *we do hear*, and beg leave to assure you, that your being *afar off* from us, might be matter of regret, were we acquainted with your personal and private virtues. But as this is not our happy lot—as we know you only by your present 'RAISED VOICE, AFAR OFF,' inviting us (I cannot say tempting us) to commit a great sin, by acknowledging an earthly spiritual march in 'calling the Pope our Master,' when Jesus Christ is our only universal Bishop, as he and he only was such to the Apostles and first Bishops of the Church, in those primitive days, we confess we do not regret your distance from us. If you must 'RAISE YOUR VOICE' and cry aloud to us, on a subject so repugnant to our consciences and abhorrent to our feelings, we can only express our sincere wishes that the distance between us were much greater than it is."

Our readers must bear in mind that in an early number of the Record, in opening our columns to the communications of our friends, we disclaimed any responsibility for the sentiments of our correspondents. This disclaimer must apply not only

to the following communications, but to any that may hereafter be published by us. The subjects discussed in the following papers are of a kindred nature, and appear in our columns at the request of the respective writers.

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE CHURCH RECORD.

For the Church Record.

APPROACHING GENERAL CONVENTION.

As the time draws nigh for the assembling of the Triennial General Council of the now great Episcopal Church of the United States, the question very naturally arises, what grave and important subjects are likely to come before it, for discussion and determination?

If several of the correspondents of the Church Record, which, from the character of its articles seems best suited to such communications, would follow the example of the present writer, perhaps a tolerably complete catalogue might be arranged.

A uniform system of ecclesiastical jurisprudence is loudly called for, and it is much to be hoped that the very able committee raised upon this point, at the last General Convention, will be fully prepared with a well matured report.

There will also, it is strongly surmised, be a decided wish in some quarters that a canon should be reported, designed to restore the office of Deacon more nearly to the primitive model. Some of the provisions of such a canon might be, that all candidates taking orders under dispensation from the classics, should only be advanced to the Priesthood upon condition of standing a full examination; that the qualifications for Priest's Orders should be rather raised than lowered, and the more rigid examination be at that door rather than at the door of Deacon's Orders; that the qualifications for Deacon's orders generally, be lowered to the present limit of dispensation, at least in the case of a large class, aspiring no higher than to the Diaconate; and that *such* be allowed to engage in certain secular employments for maintenance, in whole or in part, limiting those employments to the professions of medicine and of teaching, and to rural or farming employments.

It may also happen, in order to meet the urgent case of some of the Western Dioceses, where questions connected with Baptism are still, as formerly, largely and warmly debated, that a proposition may be submitted, to lay over until next General Convention, for restoring the English or some form of the ancient Rubric, marking immersion strongly as the authorized mode, and pouring, or aspersion, as the exception.

Few of the eastern clergy can adequately realize the position of some of their Western brethren. Constrained to admit immersion to have been '*semper, ubique et ab omnibus*,' how can they urge the claims of the ministry upon the same ground, without being exceedingly galled by the '*argumentum ad hominem*;' if you believe in immersion, why do you not practice it; or at least, why do you not yourself submit to it?

To the last question, the writer, often posed with it, knows of no answer, but that he most cheerfully would, at least hypothetically, if he could meet with a minister having undoubted Apostolic commission to immerse, who had himself received immersion through an undoubted succession of those who had themselves been immersed from the Apostles times!

How enviable, in this respect, the position of the Greek and Asiatic churches! And how deeply to be deplored the condition to which Pro-

testantism is reduced by this, amongst her many other departures from the Catholic Church, of the great Roman schism!

A branch of the Catholic Church which could supply a pure, instead of a spurious immersion; which could offer a regular, instead of a very doubtful commission to the ministry; and which should be animated by that heaven-descended spirit of humility, zeal, and self-denial which constitutes the renewed effulgence of some of our Atlantic Dioceses, in the language of one at the west, not of the church, but well entitled to judge in the matter, "would carry all before it."

A WESTERN EPISCOPALIAN.

For the Church Record.

RE-BAPTIZING.

THE re-baptizing of two of the students of the General Theological Seminary has been announced in most of our journals, but has not attracted the attention to which it is justly entitled. If it was not an innovation in the doctrine, it certainly was a departure from the usual practise of the Church, and as new things under the sun are very rare, such an unwonted event certainly demands an explanation. We of the South have always been taught to look upon New-York churchmanship as the standard of truth and order, and in many cases we can safely conform to that standard; but we cannot account for this *new movement*, and before we can follow, we must know where we are to be led. Recent events have served to render us extremely sensitive and suspicious; for, in the quaint but expressive language of Thomas Fuller, "When many popish tricks are abroad in the country, if these men meet with a ceremony which is a stranger, especially if it can give but a bad account of itself, no wonder if the watch take it up for one on suspicion."

The fact that the individual who were re-baptized, were candidates for the ministry in our Apostolic Church, is *prima facie* evidence that they were baptized in infancy, or at some period previous to their admission into the seminary: if this be the case, then they are under an obligation to state the reasons for this unusual procedure. The friends of *order in the Church* demand it of them, and of all who were concerned in the transaction. This irregularity has not only created a spirit of inquiry within our own communion, but it has been observed by other denominations, and of course, has drawn from them many pious ejaculations. The *Baptists*, particularly, are proclaiming that the Episcopal Church is about to drop *infant baptism*, and to take up believers' baptism by immersion!

In casting about for some plausible reasons to justify this re-baptizing, the following have presented themselves as most probable. Perhaps the individuals concerned, though baptized in infancy, were baptized in another communion, or by other than apostolic authority; or perhaps they were regularly baptized in the church by sprinkling or pouring, but have since come to the conclusion that *immersion* is the only scriptural mode; or perhaps they are equally balanced in opinion between the two modes, and have determined to avail themselves of the benefit of both, so that there may be no doubt about their *regeneration*.

We ask for information; this is a dangerous precedent, and may lead to still greater irregularities; for if the conscience of each scrupulous churchman is allowed to take a wayward course, infant baptism may soon *go under the water* to rise no more. Has the the Church decided upon the

mode of baptism in such a way as to insist upon *one mode* to the exclusion of others? Or, rather, had she not wisely decided, that it is *impossible* to fix upon any mode to the exclusion of all others? And when infants are presented to her in this ordinance, does she not take them in her arms and pronounce them to be the children of the covenant? She attaches no importance to the quantity of water used, but simply requires that the rite be performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Not to speak too positively, does it not contravene the spirit of the rubrics to re-baptize persons who were baptized in infancy? What apology can be drawn from her standards, or above all, from the word of God, for re-baptizing by a *trine immersion*?

SOUTH SIDE.

Our readers may recollect that in our comments upon the forty-second canon we alluded to the case of a clergyman of the Diocese of New-York, that was adjudicated under this canon. We have received from a friend of the clergyman, the following communication, and in justice to the individual interested, we give it a place in our columns.

For the Church Record.

THE FORTY-SECOND CANON.

ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

Nor being a subscriber to your paper, I did not see your judicious remarks on the 42d canon and its kindred rubrics, till some time after their publication on the 22d of May. Nor was it till the last week that an opportunity was presented of comparing your statement of the facts which occurred in the Diocese of New-York in 1832-3, with the pamphlet from which you obviously derived your materials. This must be my apology for sending you a communication nearly three months subsequently to the date of the article whose omissions it is my purpose to correct.

It was your wish, I cannot doubt, to furnish your readers with as condensed a view of the questions involved in the discussion referred to, as you were able to do with justice to the parties. I think, however, that you have inadvertently passed over some things which are requisite to throw light on the subject, and the publication of which would have forcibly illustrated the truth of some of your own positions. Suffer me, therefore, for the sake of historical accuracy, to give a more detailed account of the transactions recorded in the pamphlet, without expressing the slightest opinion as to the merits of the controversy.*

[In the year of our Lord 1832, the minister of one of the parishes having perceived, as he thought, that the progress of religion and the growth of the Church were seriously impeded in consequence of the low reputation of certain members of the vestry of the parish, made an effort to obtain other vestrymen in the mode provided for by statute, that is, by an appeal to the people who were to hold their annual meeting on Easter Monday.† In this, however, he was unsuccessful. The people having assembled to elect their vestrymen for the coming year, the vestry in power raised a question as to the right of the minister to the office which he held, declared that the connexion between themselves and him was dissolved, precluded him, of course, from the privilege of presiding in the duly-notified meeting according to the provisions of the statute,

and then persuaded the people to adjourn the meeting till the Bishop could determine whether the clergyman was *their* minister or not.*]

On the 24th April 1832, the Vestry wrote to the Bishop for his opinion on the question whether the clergyman just mentioned could be considered as rightfully entitled to the office of rector.

On the 1st of June, 1832, a meeting was held at which several of the pewholders of the parish were present, and [although the opinion of the Bishop had not been received, and the minister was excluded from the parish church as having no title to the rectorship,] one of the wardens publicly stated that the vestry intended to present to the Bishop certain charges against the said minister.

[During the months of June and July, the minister was ready and willing to preach in the parish church, and was happy, he said, to find that the real friends of the church were, but with one exception, *his* friends, and anxious to have the building re-opened for divine service. It does not appear that the Bishop had yet made any official communication on the merits of the question proposed to him. He had simply stated in a letter written in May, that from interviews held with one of the leading vestrymen, he was convinced that it would be fool-hardy for the minister to attempt to return to the parish from which he was then absent. The treasurer of the Missionary Society, however, understood from him in the month of May or June, that the parish was vacant, and in consequence thereof, dishonored one of the drafts of the minister as missionary.]

On the 7th of Sept. 1832, the Bishop gave a definite answer to the query of the Vestry, expressive of the opinion that the minister was *their* rector.

[This reply was not satisfactory to the Vestry. They would not admit that the clergyman *was* their rector, nor would they open to him the doors of the church. On the contrary, they invited another minister to officiate for them on Sunday the 23d of Sept., the Bishop having been persuaded by much entreaty to permit them to do so. The actual minister of the parish was not informed by the Bishop of his having granted this permission. He therefore attempted to officiate in the church in the morning of the said 23d of Sept. but while sitting in the desk was attacked or brow-beaten by two of the vestry, and prevented from performing his public duties. They declared that the connexion between himself and them was dissolved, and invited the other clergyman who was present to preach.]

On the 24th of Sept. the minister of the parish was presented by the vestry. In this presentment they denied in express terms the right of the accused to the office of rector, or permanent minister of the parish. [One of their accusations—the 26th—was, that on the day previous, (Sept. 23d,) he attempted to officiate in the church, although they had forbidden him. The presentment was received and recognized as canonical by the Bishop, and this charge was allowed to remain as a component part of it.]

[On the 6th of October, proximo, the accused suggested to the Bishop, that the Vestry could not, with propriety, present him for trial, because, in the very act of presentment, they denied his right to the office of permanent minister of the parish. The Bishop replied, that *he* recognized his right, and that the presentment must stand. On, or about

the 10th of October, the accused, by letter, urged the same objection. In the course of this month the Bishop made a communication to the Vestry, in which he expressed the opinion, (so far, at least, as the author of the pamphlet recollected,) that by presenting him for trial the Vestry did, in fact, acknowledge him to be their minister. Notwithstanding this inconsistency, which rendered the presentment null and void, the Bishop officially announced to the accused, on the 31st of October, that he must be tried. On the 9th of November, the accused again wrote to the Bishop, and informed him of the opinion of a highly respectable jurist, at Utica, which was decidedly against the presentment. To this the Bishop made no reply.*]

The trial was fixed for Jan. 16, 1833. On the 4th of January, a protest was handed to the Bishop [in the city of New-York] on the part of the accused, in which the ground was taken, that as the Vestry, at the date of the presentment, denied that the accused was their minister, they had not, under the canons of New-York, any right to present, upon their own showing; and therefore it was prayed that the Bishop would quash the presentment. [In reference to the 26th accusation, said the protesting minister, "If I was then their rector, the facts stated in that article show that they were guilty of an offence in preventing me from performing my duty in celebrating divine worship. If I was not their rector, they can have no right to present me."'] The Bishop acting upon the opinion of an eminent lawyer, thereupon quashed the presentment, [the objection, however, according to his private views, being merely technical, while in the judgment of the accused, it was one of principle.]

[The accused was extremely anxious, after all that had passed in the course of eight or nine months, that a committee of inquiry should be appointed, lest it should be said that he was afraid of meeting an investigation. Accordingly] on the 4th of January it was determined by the Bishop that a committee should assemble in the parish of the accused, on the 16th inst.; and he, the accused, set out [with his family in midwinter, to travel 400 miles.] in order to be present.

[On his arrival at his parish he received a letter from the Bishop, dated Jan. 8, advising him to *remove* by all means, now that he could do so with honor. "I repeat (he remarked) what I have often said, that the substantial excellences of your character are undiminished in my view." "You are not now presented, and I shall not appoint a committee of investigation until I hear whether you are willing by your own act to supersede the necessity of it. You can act consistently by resigning." Almost overwhelmed with astonishment at the reception of this document, the minister consulted a gentleman of the bar, and on the 18th inst. replied to the Bishop that, in the opinion of this friend, he had a right to demand an investigation before a committee of inquiry, that matters were every day becoming worse and worse in the parish, and he was sorry to say that a large portion of the blame had been laid on the Bishop's shoulders. He also stated that he had on that day repelled from the communion three of the Vestry who were communicants, and that in the course of a month he should be able to furnish the

* It appears, from the pamphlet, that the Bishop instead of refusing to recognize the Vestry as such, till they had recognized the claims of their minister by opening the doors of the church, found fault with *him* for not officiating in the parish; and that the minister having obtained the keys of the church, made a second effort to officiate, but was prevented by two of the Vestry who nailed up the doors.

* The additional matter is comprehended in brackets
† Easter fell on the 22d of April.

* It was afterwards maintained by the Vestry that this adjournment was illegal.

Bishop with his reasons for so doing, agreeably to the provisions of the rubrics.] The paper that they had signed, and which as a presentment had been officially pronounced uncanonical and void, was full, he alleged, of slanderous charges. [Reports seriously affecting his moral character, had been freely circulated by those whom he looked upon as the more immoral part of the Vestry, and they had sheltered themselves under the wing of one of the communicants—a man of influence. It was necessary therefore, he thought, as a conscientious minister, to make a public example of such an influential individual, and by the exercise of discipline, to convince his Christian parishioners that light ought to have no communion with darkness.]

Before he informed the Bishop [of the reasons of the repulsion,] one of the repelled complained to the Ordinary, pursuant to the canon [or rubric,] and was immediately restored by the Bishop.

On the 11th Feb., 1833, the clergyman repelled the same individual again, and then gave notice to the Bishop, [turning his reasons for the act.]

[On the 14th Feb. inst., three clergymen, members of the Committee of Inquiry which had been summoned by the Bishop, at the request of the minister of the parish, met in the parish church. The Vestry immediately started two objections to their proceeding to an investigation. The first was overruled; on the second some doubt was expressed, and it was then determined to be, upon the whole, most expedient to suspend for the present all further proceedings. The minister who had requested the Bishop to call the committee, consented to the measure, supposing that the Bishop would summon another committee. But on this very day, to wit, on the third after that on which he communicated his formal presentment—with the reasons thereof—to the Bishop,] the Vestry resolved to acknowledge him as their rector, and immediately presented him to the Bishop; [still, however, depriving him of certain privileges and rights, which he considered essential to the office of a duly settled Rector.]

The Bishop [on the 18th Feb. inst., informed the minister by letter that he had again restored the communicant who had complained to him;* and in the month of June he caused him to be tried on the second presentment drawn up by the Vestry.

[The objections of the minister to this course of proceeding were the following. The presentment of the vestry, dated Feb. 14, 1833 was, he said, as uncanonical as that of Sept. 24, 1832; the acknowledgement on their part being merely nominal. The vestry, in the second presentment, inserted the charge which in the first was numbered 26. By the authority of the Bishop, however, it was erased from the second list. If it were admitted in one presentment, the minister thought it ought to have been suffered to stand in the other, in which case he would manifestly have been entitled to the same decision as to the validity of the document, as was pronounced on the 4th of January. Before a *committee of inquiry*, he would have been allowed to make his own statement, equally with the members of the vestry; whereas, at an ecclesiastical *trial*, from the difficulty of obtaining witnesses, and the impossibility of convicting those of perjury who swear falsely, the strength of the prosecution or defence would depend in a great degree on the wealth, or personal influence, or want of principle of the parties severally concerned.

To the argument of the Bishop that, "all the charges brought by the minister against the repelled communicant were connected with matters respecting which a full ecclesiastical inquiry was pending at the time he made them," and that therefore he could not, with "justice, be instrumental in prejudicing public opinion against him, (the communicant,) by presenting him in the light of a repelled" person, and thus seeming to pre-judge the case, the minister replied in a letter, dated March 4, by referring the Bishop to his own letter of Jan. 8th, above quoted, and remarking that it was evident that on the 18th of Jan., when the repulsion took place, no inquiry was pending, nor would any have been instituted, if he, the minister had not specially requested it. To the argument of the bishop that any one repelled must "be an open and notorious evil liver," or "have done wrong to his neighbors by word or deed, so that the congregation be thereby offended," the minister replied, by inquiring into the meaning of the term *congregation*. It cannot mean, he said, the whole of the members of a parish; for an irreligious communicant may combine with the majority of the worldly part of a congregation to effect some unchristian purpose, and but a small portion of the congregation may be grievously offended, and yet the communicant in question ought by all means to be repelled. According to the canon, "if any persons . . . offend their brethren by any wickedness of life, such persons shall be repelled . . . agreeably to the rubric." The minister (he continued) in compliance with the rubric must repel "whenever he perceiveth" that repulsion is necessary, even if but two individuals beside himself are cognizant of the facts which determine him to do so. The minister therefore, must decide on his own responsibility; and if a difference of opinion should subsequently arise in reference to the feelings of the pious part of the congregation, then the court of inquiry—that being the proper tribunal—will declare whether or not sufficient offence has been given to warrant a repulsion. To the observation of the bishop, that so far as the feelings of the congregation in this matter had fallen under his notice, they were with the communicant,—the minister replied, 1st, That the information which he, the bishop, had received and relied on, was not such as to furnish him with a correct view of the actual state of the congregation; and 2dly, That one of the charges preferred against the repelled communicant supposed that unchristian means had been employed by him in order to prejudice the congregation against their minister. "How, (said he,) is such a charge to be sustained if an 'inquiry' be not 'instituted'?" I say it with the respect with which the Ordinary ought always to be addressed by the repelling minister; but it does appear to me, that by refusing to institute an inquiry having relation to a charge so grave and so peculiar, the Ordinary *pre-judges* one of the most important questions that are to be decided by testimony." In the conclusion of his letter the minister respectfully requested the bishop to revoke the instrument by which he had restored the repelled communicant. His request was not complied with.]

August, 1841.

COMPILER.

THE CHRISTIANS IN THE EAST.—It is unnecessary for us to say that the revolted Christians have our sympathy. We see in them the remains of a great civilization which has been extinguished, and, if God so please, the germ of a

grand civilization for the future: but ought we even in their own interest to encourage them in their struggles for an independence for which they are not prepared? We are not, in this case, to give way to the policy of imagination; we must inquire whether the Christian people of the East would not perish in the fall of the Ottoman empire.

We must inquire whether in attempting to anticipate their freedom they would not avert it. Let those persons who do not reflect build up in their imagination a triumphant Greek empire on the ruins of Turkey: we shall put only a practical question. We ask whether France, by taking under her patronage the insurrection of the Christian population of Turkey, would not do them more harm than good? Is this the kind of intervention demanded of us by humanity, reason, and sound policy? If we have duties of sympathy and generosity to perform towards the Christians of the East, have we not also to perform duties of justice towards Turkey, and of interest towards ourselves.

In condemning without reserve the insurrection, we are not prevented from exercising our influence with the Porte towards obtaining for its Christian subjects better conditions, a more liberal system of Government—in a word, real rights in place of the chimerical independence which they ask for. Our claims on their behalf would have the greater weight, as being in themselves a clear and formal acknowledgment of the sovereignty of the Porte, and all Europe would support them, whereas, by the slightest encouragement of the insurrection, this pacific mode of intervention would be closed to us. If we were to form Committees in Paris in favor of the revolted Christians, we should in vain talk of humanity and justice at Constantinople, for we should not be listened to. The Porte would regard us, and with reason, as enemies.

In such case we should have to intervene by force in favor of the Christian population of the East, or to assist, perhaps, in their total extermination. Now, who would venture to advise the government to resort to force? Who does not see that, in the immense conflict to which such an intervention would give rise, the Christians themselves, on whose behalf we should have interfered, would be the first to disappear? Who would care for the Greeks of Candia and this independence, when the real question would be the independence of Europe? See the results of the armed intervention of the Powers who signed the treaty of July, the avowed object of which was merely to protect the Porte against a rebel vassal, and to replace it in possession of its provinces. The Pacha has submitted, it is true. It was not difficult for a few English gunners to overcome the Egyptian military. Beyrout and St. Jean d'Acre were bombarded; but what is become of the real or apparent object of the treaty? By restoring Syria to the Porte, the latter has only obtained an increase of anarchy to hasten its destruction. The Powers who signed the treaty of the 15th July have laid upon Turkey a burden which is crushing her, and a general war was with difficulty averted. All the European Powers are still in arms, and though we hope that in a short time the treaty of July 15 will only figure in history as a great diplomatic error, the suspicion and distrust which this fatal treaty has sown between Cabinets, and the sensation created by it, will not be readily effaced. The integrity of the Ottoman empire was the object or pretext of intervention, and this integrity is certainly more in peril now than it was a year ago. Sincere or insincere, the armed protection of the Powers of Europe was a murderous protection for the Porte, and our intervention in favor of the Christian insurgents, at this moment, would not be less fatal to them."—*Jour. Des Debats*.

To Readers and Correspondents.

WE have received from Messrs. Hooker & Agnew, Philadelphia, No. 2 of the "Churchman's Library," which by some oversight, we have neglected to notice. It shall receive attention in our next.

"ORTHODOXY" next week.

* The grounds taken by the bishop, are mentioned in the Church Record of May 22d. Prefixed are the comments of the editor.